

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Eva Anderson,

Plaintiff,

v.

Kenneth L. Baritz, Esq., et al,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 24-2095

ORDER

AND NOW, this 23rd day of April 2025, upon consideration of the Motion for a More Definite Statement by Kenneth L. Baritz, Esquire and Baritz Law Associates (ECF Nos. 40 & 41), Anderson’s Response (ECF No. 45), and the Baritz Defendants’ Reply (ECF No. 47), it is **ORDERED** that the Motion is **DENIED**.¹

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Gerald J. Pappert
Gerald J. Pappert, J.

¹ Anderson’s SAC specifically incorporates her FAC in its entirety, (SAC p.10), so all the factual allegations and claims for relief in the FAC are still operative. *W. Run Student Hous. Assocs., LLC v. Huntington Nat. Bank*, 712 F.3d 165, 171 (3d Cir. 2013). The Baritz Defendants may simply Answer the allegations contained in the FAC. They need not answer the new allegations contained in the SAC because those allegations should have only included “facts that could show [PMC] is a debt collector,” (Mem. Op. Jan. 27, 2025 at 18), and Anderson concedes that the SAC “pertains exclusively to PMC . . . and related entities,” (Resp. to Mot. for More Definite Statement 5.)